

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 871

FL 014 247

AUTHOR Gutstein, Shelley P.
TITLE Using Language Functions to Measure Fluency.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 4lp.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Toronto, Ontario, March 1983).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Classroom Communication; Dialogs (Language); *Diaries; *English (Second Language); Intensive Language Courses; Japanese; *Language Fluency; *Language Tests; Measurement Techniques; Research Needs; *Second Language Instruction; Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Dialogue Journals; *Language Functions

ABSTRACT

The lack of authentic, real-world interaction practice in the English as a second language (ESL) classroom is described and discussed, and the ways in which dialogue journals answer this classroom need are detailed. A dialogue journal is an interactive, self-generated, cumulative and functional writing and reading exchange between teacher and student. The results are reported of a pilot study of the functional nature of the language in dialogue journals of adult Japanese as ESL students. The study used a system of language function analysis developed by Roger Shuy (1982). A definition of written fluency is offered and the relationship of language functions to written fluency is discussed. Methodological considerations and research suggestions are proposed. (Author/MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED240871

1

Using Language Functions to Measure Fluency*

Shelley P. Gutstein
March 1983

Authentic, natural real world communication practice has long been valued as an integral part of the language learning process. Unfortunately, this type of practice is often missing from the EFL classroom. Dialogue journal writing offers such practice to EFL students in a positive, non-threatening way. A dialogue journal is an interactive, self-generated, cumulative and functional writing/reading exchange between teacher and student. Dialogue journals have been used in many kinds of classrooms, with all age groups and at all levels of English proficiency.

The present paper describes and discusses the lack of authentic, real world interaction practice in the EFL classroom, and details the ways in which dialogue journals answer this classroom need. The paper further reports the results of a pilot study of the functional nature of the language in the dialogue journals of adult, Japanese L₁ students of English as a Foreign Language. The study used a system of language function analysis developed by Shuy (1982). A definition of written fluency is offered and the relationship of language functions to written fluency is discussed. The paper concludes with a discussion of methodological considerations and with suggestions for avenues of future research.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shelley Gutstein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014247

*This paper is based on a presentation given at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention in Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983. The author wishes to thank Roger Shuy and Joy Kreeft for their constructive and helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

One of the primary goals of foreign language instruction is to enable the learner to use the target language naturally, spontaneously, fluently and communicatively. Other objectives which may form the basis for a language teaching curriculum include the learning of correct grammar, training in and mastery of specific skills such as reading, speaking, listening or writing, mastery of a given body of data or vocabulary in the target language (e.g. English for Special Purposes), or the acquisition of study skills and production skills such as composition writing, library research and term paper writing, to name a few. In any foreign language learning situation, one or more of the aforementioned objectives will constitute the goal toward which the curriculum, and consequently, classroom activities are directed.

Foreign nationals studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in an English speaking country face special problems regarding the learning of the effective communication skills mentioned above. Effective communication is an absolute necessity for these students, not a choice. The students live in an English-speaking culture to which they are newcomers. They must adapt to its customs and protocols in order to survive. Their need for communicative skills begins the moment they enter that English-speaking world, not when they finally make their way to the EFL classroom.

Recent developments in language teaching theory and classroom practice have begun to address the need for immediate communicative language practice. Many innovative approaches have emerged within the past ten years. Among these are the Communicative Competence Approach (Paulston, 1974), the Notional Functional Approach (Wilkins, 1976; Van Ek, 1976; Munby, 1978 and others), and the Situational Approach (Chastain, 1980). All of these approaches share the characteristic of providing a real world context for language practice in the classroom. Units of language are presented within the context of a communicative goal, need, situation or notion. Students then rehearse specific grammatical structures related to the context. Communicative practice of the structures is then provided within the same situational, communicative or notional framework with which the lesson was introduced. Paulston (1974) calls this kind of practice communicative performance. After practicing communicative performance within the classroom, the next step, according to Paulston, is controlled real world practice wherein the student uses the language he possesses to accomplish goals outside the classroom. Directed from within the classroom, this authentic language practice allows the student to interact with his environment at his level of language proficiency. Paulston notes that, due to preparation time constraints on the teacher, this type of controlled interaction with the world outside the classroom, though eminently desirable, is absent from the majority of language lessons.

From a theoretical perspective, the abovementioned approaches have enjoyed widespread acceptance. A large number of EFL professionals see

the merit in presenting the language to the students in communicative ways. However, a great many of these same professionals teach in programs which have not adopted any of these curricula. These programs might follow a grammatical or skill oriented syllabus. Often, the curriculum in such a program integrates the grammatical approach into components based on the four major language skills: writing, reading, speaking and listening. Individual teachers, of course, may structure their courses in communicative ways, but they then face the task of incorporating the real world interaction practice into their lessons.

Let us consider, for a moment, what has been called the traditional approach to teaching--the grammatical approach. The curriculum in this approach follows a syllabus which is organized around the structures and forms of the language. Structures are presented in what is presumed to be increasing order of difficulty. Students practice the individual structures until a certain degree of mastery is attained. In the belief that the production of inaccurate forms reinforces errors, teachers often encourage students to use in the classroom only those forms they have mastered. Often little communicative practice accompanies this presentation. Students put the structures together in an interlocking, jigsaw way, and often the result is as flat and lifeless as a jigsaw puzzle.

It is clear from the discussion above that students in traditional settings do not obtain the communicative practice they need. While students in communicatively oriented classrooms engage in abundant in-class communicative practice, these students do not get enough of the controlled real world practice mentioned earlier. Given these two categories of

students, we have to ask the same fundamental question: How are these students going to learn to use language in spontaneous, communicative and natural ways?

Some answers to this question can be found in dialogue journal writing. A dialogue journal is a written exchange between the teacher and each student. Every time the class meets, students write for a fixed period of time in a bound notebook.¹ The teacher takes the notebooks,

¹ Although the procedure noted here calls for in-class writing, other approaches have also used dialogue journal writing outside of class.

writes back to each student and returns the notebooks to the students the following class period. This activity continues throughout the entire academic term. No correction or evaluation of writing takes place, rather, the teacher and student play an equal role in a written conversation, where both, according to Staton (1982) play an equal part in the dialogue, share turns, have the right to bring up any topics that both consider appropriate and have a great deal of freedom to generate their own topics instead of writing about what the other person says they should write about. In other words, teacher and students communicate about topics of importance to their lives--authentic communication at its best.

The authenticity of this communication can be seen in the two dialogue journal exchanges represented below. These entries were produced by a Japanese adult male and his EFL teacher. The first exchange was written during the second week of the term and the second exchange came from the end of the term.

July 9

Student

I stayed L. A. for 4 weeks.

L. A. is very beautiful, comfortable and fun.

Tennessee is very beautiful and wonderful, too.

But it is very hot.

By the way

I want English-English Dictionary.

Which is the best it?

And I can play piano a little.

But I can not play ~~guitar~~ guitar?

Can you play it?

If you can play it, I want you to tell me.

July 9

Teacher

I will look in the bookstore because I don't know which dictionaries they have. Then I will tell you which dictionary to buy. I will tell you on Monday, O. K.?

Piano is my second favorite instrument. How wonderful that you can play. Yes, I do play the guitar and you will hear me today!

I think Tennessee is the hottest place in the world!

Did you enjoy Hillbilly night?

Sept. 3

Student:

At last, I give up. My Japanese professor said,
'Don't play the Iai-do.' 'Never.' 'We never allow you
to take Dr. John.'

I wanted to stay here.

But I can't.

I went to canoe trip.

My camera ~~is~~ broken.
was

I wanted to play Iai-do.

But I can't.

By the way, I want ~~to~~ this journals' copy.

I hope you enjoy tonight party.

Sept. 3

Teacher:

I can assure you, I will enjoy the party. I'm
thrilled and flattered that the class is going to
so much trouble for me.

I'm sorry that your professors are so unreason-
able. They have no reason to be so.

You have had a bit of bad luck lately. But
I firmly believe that everything works out for the
best. Do you understand this sentence?

Thanks in advance for the party--and have a
good time at NASA!

It can be seen, from this preliminary look at dialogue journal writing, that what happens here parallels real world communication. The writers share ideas, communicate information, ask and answer questions, give opinions and share emotions.

Staton (1982) has found that dialogue journal writing is self-generated, interactive, cumulative and functional in nature. These four qualities combine to make dialogue journal writing appropriate as the controlled real world practice mentioned earlier.

That the journals are self-generated is clear from the spontaneity of the examples above. Both teacher and student write because they have something to say, because they genuinely seek information--about guitars, dictionaries, each other. Topics are generated from within, not imposed from without.

Journal writing is interactive in much the same way as is a conversation between friends. The two participants maintain a balanced communication and have equal roles in it. The conversation is sustained and each writer gets feedback. In this regard the journals parallel real world oral interactions.

Dialogue journal writing is cumulative over time. This allows the writers to develop topics, extend them, recycle them, and elaborate on them. The luxury of time allows the writers to build rapport, to become comfortable with the language and to continue talking/writing about the same topic if they so desire.

The last characteristic of dialogue journal writing is that it is functional and purposive in nature. The writers use language to accomplish goals: Teacher and student alike use language to convey information,

apologize, offer, promise, request, and evaluate, to name a few of the functions found in dialogue journal writing. The functional nature of this writing forms the basis for the research reported below.

Since dialogue journal writing exhibits the qualities discussed above, and since journal communication takes place at the students' level of ability in English, it is clear that dialogue journals can provide the opportunity for the students to engage in the kind of real world practice outlined by Paulston. Students interact in the target language, with a caring and supportive native (or near-native) speaker. Students use the target language purposively, to accomplish functional, communicative goals.

With these thoughts in mind, I set out to analyze the functional language in the dialogue journals of a group of adult EFL students I had taught. In writing dialogue journals with this group, I had sensed changes, developments in communicative ability and in fluency, that were evident both in their journals and outside in their verbal communications with me. My goal was to study the journals to locate evidence for the changes I had observed and to document them in a formal way. To do this I had to employ a rather novel analysis for my data, since fluency and communicative ability are difficult to measure, and each poses some theoretical problems that will be discussed below. One other study of functional language in dialogue journals does exist (Shuy, 1982). That study, upon which I base my methodology, addressed the functional language use in the dialogue journals of sixth grade students and their teacher. The students in Shuy's study were all native speakers of English.

The students who participated in the present study were all adult, male, native speakers of Japanese. In the summer of 1981, they participated in a 10 week intensive course in English as a Foreign Language at the University of Tennessee at Martin (UTM). I was their grammar teacher. Our class met two hours daily, five days per week. We wrote in the journals every day. This yielded approximately 42 interactions over the 10 week period. Five of the 19 journals in the database form the corpus for the present study. These five were selected as representative of the 19 based on such criteria as teacher evaluation, standardized test scores and amount written in the journal.

The learning situation of these students made using the journals particularly appropriate as a means of encouraging self-expression. All nineteen students had studied English in Japan, but few had actually used English as a living language. Rather, the focus of their instruction in Japan was on reading and grammar, not on productive skills such as writing or speaking. This type of training dictated attention to the details of grammar and created anxiety at the merest hint of error. In the beginning of the course, therefore, (and for some students throughout the course) the students were reluctant to talk, and were certainly a passive group to work with. Fortunately, but not surprisingly, they were not reluctant to write.

The grammar class itself was fairly formal and traditional in nature, and was geared toward the pre-academic student. The special summer program followed the same curriculum as the academic year regular intensive EFL program. However, these Japanese students all returned to Japan following the end of the course. The textbook used was situationally oriented, but

unfortunately, many of the situations were completely alien to these students. One lesson, for example, involved the vocabulary and expressions necessary to repair a broken doorbell. I employed some communicative drills and activities to augment the course materials, but the students were reluctant to use English with their Japanese-speaking classmates, and, especially at the beginning of the course, they tended to resist any non-traditional teaching techniques.

For many of the students, the dialogue journals were one of the few opportunities they had daily to actively use English. There were 200 Japanese students participating in the program, and, at that time, only a few American summer school students available for them to converse with. The Japanese students were very group oriented and in many cases did not seek out conversation opportunities with the locals.

Writing dialogue journals, however, required that the students use English communicatively, in a conversationally interactive way with me, their teacher, for at least the 15-20 minutes they spent each class reading my responses and writing back to me; the activity did not threaten them the way that other communication activities did.

Given this background and the experience of working with these students in the UTM summer program, I proposed to do three things: first, to describe the journal data I had in a formal way; second, to study the purposive functional nature of the writing; and third, to try to show some positive increase or progression in terms of function use and written fluency.

In analyzing the functional nature of the language in the journals, some basic research questions must be posed: Given the freedom to write

whatever they wished, what language functions were used by the students and with what frequency? What language functions does the teacher use and with what frequency? Is there a change in language function use for teacher or students over time, and if so, what is the nature of the change? Last, what is the relationship between functional language use and fluency?

Fluency, here, is defined in Fillmore's (1979) sense. According to Fillmore, a speaker is judged to be fluent if he is able to 1) fill time with talk, 2) talk in coherent, reasoned sentences, 3) have appropriate things to say in a wide range of contexts and 4) be creative and imaginative in language use. (p. 93) Following Fillmore's criteria, fluency in dialogue journal writing is defined as follows. First, a fluent writer is one who can write at length with few pauses. This is not necessarily the same as quantity of writing. Fluent writers may convey their ideas in relatively few sentences. In dialogue journals, a fluent writer writes easily and quickly. Second, a fluent writer writes in coherent, reasoned sentences. These sentences reflect grammatical accuracy. The semantic and syntactic relationships between sentences are clear and the sentences have meaning. Third, the fluent writer uses language appropriately in a wide range of contexts. In writing, context refers to the different purposes for which language is employed; to request, inform, evaluate, thank, offer opinions, etc. Last, the fluent writer is creative and imaginative in language use. While it might seem that writers might not possess in the second language the abilities Fillmore outlines (making puns, jokes, using metaphors), students writing in dialogue journals do exhibit many of these abilities.

According to Fillmore, a fluent speaker possesses all four of the qualities he outlines. It follows that a fluent dialogue journal writer would possess all four qualities mentioned above. Analysis of all four qualities is beyond the scope of the present work, therefore our attention is focused on the third criterion, as manifested in functional language use.

To begin describing the functional nature of dialogue journal writing and to study the relationship of functional language use and fluency, a modified version of the analysis used by Shuy (1982) was employed. The analysis consisted of the following steps. First, sample periods of writing were selected for study. A week's worth (5 consecutive interactions) of writing was selected from the beginning of the course (Week 2), and another week's worth of interactions was selected from the end (Week 9). The unit of analysis, as in Shuy's study, was the writer's punctuated or otherwise marked written sentence. Each individual journal was first coded for units and then each unit was analyzed to determine the functions it contained. The sample entries below illustrate this stage of the analysis.

<u>UNIT</u>	<u>FUNCTION</u>
Entry 1—Hayashi	
1. I like to play Black Jack and so on.	1. Response to a question plus reporting personal fact.
2. Last night we won the softball game.	2. Reporting general fact.
3. Thank you, Miss Gutstein.	3. Thanking.
4. You saw our softball game.	4. Reporting general fact.

5. We'll wear the team shirts and
win the game on wednesday.

6. It is hot today, too

Entry 2--Suzuki

1. I don't buy a dictionary yet.

2. If you take me bookstore and
choose my dictionary, I am
delightful.

3. Prepositions are very difficult
for me.

4. In Japan, when I take English
examination, I lose point due to
prepositions.

5. Also, I want to know about an
idiom.

5. Predicting

6. Reporting general fact.

1. Reporting personal fact plus
response to a question.

2. Predicting, plus reporting
an opinion.

3. Reporting an opinion.

4. Reporting personal fact.

5. Reporting personal fact and
requesting general information.

Shuy's definitions for the language functions were used and the reader is referred to his study (Shuy, 1982) for additional details. In examining Entry 1, it is important to note that the question which triggered the response in Unit 1 is contained in the teacher entry immediately prior to the entry cited. A personal fact is a statement of factual nature which has direct personal import upon the person who utters it. In contrast, a general fact is a general truth that applies to the world around the speaker. Unit 2 of Entry 1 contains a general fact.

In the original analysis, units 3 and 4 of Entry 1 were analyzed as discrete units, the former being a case of thanking and the latter a report of a general fact. It has been pointed out (Bodman and Eisenstein, 1983) that thanking is actually a speech act set, in which the actual words Thank you are in many situations accompanied by additional phrases or sentences which form part of the thanking act. For the purpose of consistency in the analysis, the original function units are maintained for the present work. Bodman and Eisenstein's analysis will most certainly form a part of future analysis with this data.

Determining the function content of each unit was sometimes problematic, as in the case of Entry 2, Unit 3. Although this unit was coded as an opinion, the possibility exists that it is a personal fact, a fact that the writer perceives to be true about himself. Researcher perception of truth (whether prepositions were, in fact, hard for the student, as measured, perhaps, by some objective test) must play a secondary role to the writer's own perception, which, in fact, produced the sentence.

The language functions which appeared in this sample are summarized in Table 1. The array differs slightly from that found by Shuy in his study, most specifically in requesting functions. Shuy's three-way division included information, procedure, and opinion questions. The data from these Japanese adults revealed a different array of questions: requests for clarification, for general versus personal information, and for opinions. As will be discussed below, student questioning is very infrequent. The four-way division may reveal patterns which might otherwise be overlooked.

TABLE 1

Language Functions Tabulated in this Sample

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Reporting opinions | 9. Evaluating |
| 2. Reporting personal facts | 10. Offering |
| 3. Reporting general facts | 11. Promising |
| 4. Responding to questions | 12. Requesting clarification |
| 5. Predicting | 13. Requesting general information |
| 6. Giving directives | 14. Requesting personal information |
| 7. Apologizing | 15. Requesting opinions |
| 8. Thanking | 16. Imitation |
| | 17. Formulas |

After the units were determined and analyzed for functions, the occurrences of each function were counted and tallied, first for Week 2 and then for Week 9. Thus, frequency of occurrence was determined for each of the functions during the respective weeks. The results of these initial tallies can be found in Appendices A-H. Appendices A, C, E, and G contain information about the actual numbers of functions produced, while Appendices B, D, F, and H show percents for each function. Appendices A-D reflect the results for Week 2 of the analysis, while Appendices E-H reflect Week 9 production.

It is easier, however, to describe the data and look for trends if we summarize the results of this analysis. To answer the question "What is the functional nature of dialogue journal writing?" in a general way, the results in Table 2 will prove helpful. It is clear that the teacher in this sample reported more opinions, reported more general facts, predicted more, gave more directives, evaluated more and requested much more than the students did. The students, in contrast, reported many more personal facts, responded to more questions (because more were asked of them) and requested more general information. Simultaneous functions are represented here for the sake of comparison, however they do not form part of the total counts. Simultaneous functions will be discussed in depth below.

Interestingly, students and teacher produced approximately the same numbers of functions. This may be due to the fact that the teacher attempted to match the students' writing for length. However, one might hypothesize that the teacher would produce more functions than the students did. Table 3 shows that this was not consistently the case.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON BY FUNCTION TOTALS
WEEKS 2 AND 9 COMBINED

	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Promising	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Imitation	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Totals
TEACHER	90	64	51	24	36	21	3	6	31	1	4	4	35	11	27	0	4	42	412
STUDENTS	79	151	27	41	28	14	3	4	14	2	0	1	13	14	1	7	7	58	406

ble 3

COMPARISON BY TOTAL PRODUCTION

	Week 2	Week 9	Total
Teacher	208	204	412
Students	196	210	406

While a 10 week term is rather short to be looking for changes in function use, some changes do occur. The majority of these changes occur in individual students, with few group trends apparent. Since dialogue journals offer the opportunity for individualization in instruction (Staton, 1982), it is not surprising that individual changes predominate over group results.

Table 4 summarizes the changes in reporting functions on a student by student basis. While there were no consistent changes that were true for all the students, some interesting patterns emerge. For Fuji and Zenba, a drop in the reporting of opinions coincided with an increase in the reporting of personal facts. For two other students, Hayashi and Tomita, a rather large drop in the reporting of personal facts coincided with a sharp increase in the reporting of opinions. Suzuki showed slight increases in personal fact and opinion reporting and a decrease in reporting of general facts. Perhaps an analysis of other similarities between the students who pattern similarly, or a comparison of these students to the entire database of 19 journals will reveal more significant patterns.

The function of requesting occurs very infrequently in the student writing. In contrast, questions made up between 10-30% of the teacher's writing. Tables 5 and 6 show the results, in percents, for teacher and student requesting. The students almost exclusively asked general information questions and refrained from requesting personal information of the teacher, or asking her opinion. This is quite likely due to cultural differences between the students and their teacher. In Japanese culture, it is quite uncommon for students to ask their teachers about their personal lives, and the percentages of student questions reflects this. As their

TABLE 4

REPORTING FUNCTIONS-STUDENTS

Percents

	Personal Facts			General Facts			Opinions		
	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-
FUJI	20.8	25.0	+	4.2	3.5	-	25.0	17.8	-
HAYASHI	41.0	25.9	-	17.9	5.6	-	15.4	31.4	+
SUZUKI	47.2	54.5	+	5.5	1.8	-	10.9	18.2	+
TOMITA	64.5	25.0	-	6.4	7.1	+	3.2	32.1	+
ZENBA	23.4	33.3	+	14.9	0	-	23.4	17.8	-

TABLE 5

REQUESTING FUNCTIONS-STUDENTS

Percents

	Personal Information			General Information			Opinions		
	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-
FUJI	12.5	28.5	+	0	3.5	+	0	0	n/c
HAYASHI	0	0	n/c	5.1	1.9	-	0	0	n/c
SUZUKI	0	0	n/c	3.6	3.6	n/c	0	0	n/c
TOMITA	0	0	n/c	6.4	7.1	+	0	3.6	+
ZENBA	6.4	0	-	0	0	n/c	0	0	n/c

I=Week 2
II=Week 9

TABLE 6
REQUESTING FUNCTIONS-TEACHER
Percents

Teacher to:	Personal Information			General Information			Opinions		
	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-	I	II	+/-
FUJI	10.5	5.4	-	5.3	0	-	0	13.5	+
HAYASHI	5.6	9.3	+	8.3	2.3	-	13.9	9.3	-
SUZUKI	9.4	11.8	+	0	0	n/c	0	1.9	+
TOMITA	12.1	5.8	-	6.1	0	-	3.0	2.9	n/c
ZENBA	10.9	15.0	+	6.5	0	-	15.2	7.5	-

teacher, on the other hand, I purposely asked many questions, with the purpose of encouraging the students to write more.

Looking at the student requesting patterns, only two students requested any sort of personal information. Zenba asked fairly neutral questions about the teacher's car. Fuji, on the other hand, is intriguing because he engaged the teacher in direct dialoguing almost from the beginning. He was a somewhat recalcitrant student, and his large increase in requests for personal information coincided with a positive change in his classroom behavior and attitude.

Table 7 illustrates the answering patterns that emerged in this sample, both for the teacher and for the students. In this sample, the teacher answered all of the student's questions. This, in fact, does not reflect reality, since it is quite unusual for a speaker to respond to every question he is asked. The students, however, were not as uniform in their answering patterns and certainly did not respond to every question they were asked. Some individual differences emerge here. Fuji increased considerably in his responses, coinciding with his increased questioning mentioned earlier. This is the student who wrote the least, seemed uncooperative at the beginning, yet changed dramatically in terms of cooperativeness toward the end of the term. Zenba's increase in responses coincides with a possible overload of questioning by the teacher. In the data sample for Week 9, teacher entries comprised entirely of questions were found. Zenba's reaction to this was to compose in his journal dialogues between himself and the teacher, in which he gave his responses. His creativity in using this device to respond to the questions eloquently communicates his reaction to the question overload. In the original

TABLE 7
COOPERATION IN WRITING
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Week 2

	Number Asked By Teacher	Number Answered By Student	% of Response	No. Asked By Student	No. Ans. By Teacher
FUJI	8	3	38	4	4
HAYASHI	11	8	73	1	1
SUZUKI	7	4	57	2	2
TOMITA	6	5	83	0	0
ZENBA	16	6	38	2	2

Week 9

FUJI	6	4	67	9	9
HAYASHI	9	7	78	0	0
SUZUKI	7	3	43	2	2
TOMITA	2	1	50	0	0
ZENBA	12	8	67	0	0

tallies (Appendices A-H) this response of Zenba's has been called Imitation, though Distancing has also been suggested as a more descriptive term.

(Roberta Boss, personal communication)

Suzuki and Tomita, in week 9, were involved in recounting personal events of some significance to them. Answering the teacher's questions would have forced them to digress from their topics. Quite possibly, this is why they did not respond to the questions. This also suggests a relationship between topic and function which will certainly be explored as this study continues.

Simultaneous functions are tabulated in Table 8. Simultaneous functions are those functions which co-occur in the same measured unit of text. My hypotheses about simultaneous functions were that the teacher would produce more simultaneous functions than the students, and that the students would increase in their use of simultaneous functions over the course of the term. Simultaneous functions can be very complex syntactically and I had postulated that the students' ability to use them might increase over time. This hypothesis coincides with the current belief among language teachers that students come to use more complex language as a result of classroom learning and exposure to the language. None of my hypotheses was borne out, as the students wrote more simultaneous functions than the teacher did (See Table 2: 58-42) and three of the students actually decreased in the number of simultaneous functions they produced.

It is interesting to note that the most frequently occurring simultaneous function was a response to a question joined with a report of a personal fact or a report of an opinion. One might contend, then, that the question had elicited the simultaneous function that appeared, that the student did

TABLE 8
SIMULTANEOUS FUNCTIONS
Total Counts by Week

STUDENT:	I	II	+/-
FUJI	4	10	+
HAYASHI	6	7	+
SUZUKI	8	2	-
TOMITA	4	3	-
ZENBA	8	6	-

TEACHER TO:	I	II	+/-
FUJI	4	7	+
HAYASHI	3	4	+
SUZUKI	9	2	-
TOMITA	3	4	+
ZENBA	5	1	-

not produce it spontaneously. The existence of other combinations of simultaneous functions, as well as the existence of triple functions might serve to refute this contention. Triple simultaneous functions were quite few in number and were coded along with double functions. An analysis of all 19 journals in the database, or analysis of data collected over a longer period of time might reveal more conclusive results.

The only consistent increase found in the student data was an increase in the variety of different functions used. Table 9 illustrates this increase. If a function was used in the Week 2 sample, it was considered as part of a store of functions (Potential Functions) available for use during Week 9. Also considered potential were the functions which first appeared during Week 9. Not all of the potential functions were actually used during Week 9. For example, during Week 2, Hayashi used 8 different functions in his writing. The number of functions available to him during Week 9 were these 8, plus the three he added: Directives, Evaluation and Apology. Of the 11 total functions available, he actually used 9 of them in his writing. All of the students increased in the number of functions available to them during the Week 9 period. The possibility exists, of course, that the new functions were actually potential at the beginning and that they did not appear during Week 2 because of some other controlling factor, such as topic. The next stage of this analysis will most certainly examine the relationship of topic and function.

The question of emerging or matching functions has also been raised. The students in this sample are adult, native speakers of Japanese, fully competent, functional and communicative in this language. Their ability to use Japanese in functional ways may somehow transfer to English, or

TABLE 9

VARIETY OF FUNCTIONS USED

Numbers of Different Functions Employed
By Students

	Week 2	Week 9		
	Functions Used	Functions Used	New Functions	Potential Functions
FUJI	11	8	1 Formulas	12
HAYASHI	8	9	3 Evaluation Directives Apology	11
SUZUKI	8	8	1 Thanking	9
TOMITA	7	8	2 Thanking Requesting Opinions	9
ZENBA	8	7	2 Formulas Imitation	10

some matching activity might be taking place between English functions, and the rules for their use, and Japanese functions.

The results of the foregoing analysis tend more to suggest avenues of future research rather than to give conclusive answers to the research questions that were posed earlier. We have seen that group trends are not apparent in the language function use of the students. Patterns in individual differences have emerged and will be the source of future study. Additionally, the link between language function use and fluency has not yet been clearly demonstrated. Further exploration of simultaneous functions and cumulative function use may reveal trends not apparent at this stage of investigation.

Another important issue is the system of function analysis described at the beginning. While Shuy's system proved to be an excellent starting point, certain problems of analysis emerged which suggest that the system may need expansion. Defining the functions such that they divide language into mutually exclusive categories poses some problems when actual functions/per/unit determinations must be made. Perhaps a hierarchical system of functions or a system in which functions are grouped according to some yet to be determined criteria will produce a more satisfactory description of this data.²

²I am grateful for these ideas to Earl Stevick, who pointed them out to me in a recent personal communication.

Other areas of analysis suggest themselves from the dialogue journal data of second language learners. As mentioned earlier, an analysis of the interaction between topic and function would reveal to what extent, if any, the topic being discussed controls the array of functions available for utilization. Additionally, analyses of topic continuation and topic shift, analysis of questioning patterns in the journals, analysis of teaching in the journals--the extent to which the students incorporate into their own writing structures previously used by the teacher--, and analysis of grammar patterns in the journals are all possibilities for study. Many of these topics are currently being researched.³

³

Joy Kreeft's doctoral dissertation (Georgetown University) will explore many of these questions.

Further research is needed with data collected over a longer time period, with data collected from heterogeneous classes, and with classes at different proficiency levels and in different educational settings. Within the database cited here, study of all nineteen journals may reveal changes and trends not apparent in the smaller sample.

In any event, it is clear that dialogue journals have a place as a supplemental, yet integral part of the EFL language learning classroom, providing necessary, authentic communicative writing in English. Discovering the characteristics of the journals, along with their effect on the language learning process, promises to be a fruitful and enlightening adventure.

REFERENCES

- Bodman, J. and M. Eisenstein. 1983. 'I very appreciate.' Expressions of gratitude in advanced learners of English as a second language. Paper presented at the TESOL International Convention, Toronto, Canada, March, 1983.
- Chastain, K. 1980. Toward a philosophy of second language learning and teaching. Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, Inc.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1979. On Fluency. In Charles Fillmore, Daniel Kempler and William S.-Y. Wang (Eds.), Individual differences in language ability and language behavior. New York: Academic Press. pp. 85-101.
- Munby, J. 1978. Communicative syllabus design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulston, C. B. 1974. Linguistic and communicative competence. TESOL Quarterly 8, 4:347-362.
- Shuy, R. W. 1982. Analysis of language functions in dialogue journal writing. In J. Staton, R. Shuy, J. Kreeft and L. Reed, Analysis of dialogue journal writing as a communicative event, 2. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Staton, J., R. Shuy, J. Kreeft and L. Reed. 1982. Analysis of dialogue journal writing as a communicative event, Vols. 1 and 2. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Van Ek, J. A. 1976. The threshold level for modern language learning in schools. Great Britain: Longman.

Wilkins, D. A. 1976. Notional syllabuses. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

Teacher Writing Week 2 Total Counts

TEACHER TO:	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Promising	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Total Teacher Production
FUJI	5	6	9	6	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	4	38
HAYASHI	9	5	3	0	4	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	3	36
SUZUKI	9	7	13	3	9	5	1	1	2	1	3	0	6	0	0	1	9	55
TONITA	10	3	4	2	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	3	33
ZENBA	5	9	9	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	7	2	5	46
Total per Function	38	30	38	14	21	9	2	2	9	1	3	0	15	10	13	3	24	208

APPENDIX B

Teacher Writing Week 2 Percents

TEACHER TO:	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Promising Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Percent of Total Teacher Production
FUJII	13.1	15.7	23.6	15.7	5.3	7.9	0	2.6	0	0	0	10.5	5.3	0	0		18.3
HAYASHI	25.0	13.9	8.3	0	11.1	2.8	2.8	0	8.3	0	0	5.6	8.3	13.9	0		17.3
SUZUKI	14.1	10.9	20.3	4.7	14.1	7.8	1.5	1.5	3.1	1.5	4.7	0	9.4	0	1.5		26.4
TOMITA	30.3	9.1	12.1	6.1	12.1	0	0	0	9.1	0	0	12.1	6.1	3.0	0		15.9
ZENBA	10.9	19.6	19.6	6.5	4.3	0	0	0	2.2	0	0	10.9	6.5	15.2	4.3		22.1
Percent of Total Functions	18.3	14.4	18.3	6.7	10.1	4.3	1.0	1.0	4.3	0.5	1.4	7.2	4.8	6.3	1.4		

APPENDIX C

Student Writing
Week 2
Total Counts

STUDENT	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Total Student Production
FUJI	6	5	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	4	24
HAYASHI	6	16	7	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	6	39
SUZUKI	6	26	3	6	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	8	55
TOHITA	1	20	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	31
ZENBA	11	11	7	7	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	47
Total per Function	30	78	20	20	13	10	1	2	6	2	1	5	8	0	0	30	196

APPENDIX D
Student Writing
Week 2
Percents

STUDENT	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Percent of Total Student Production
FUJI	25.0	20.8	4.2	12.5	8.3	4.2	0	4.2	0	4.2	4.2	12.5	0	0	0		12.2
HAYASHI	15.4	41.0	17.9	7.7	7.7	0	0	2.6	0	2.6	0	0	0	0	0		19.9
SUZUKI	10.9	47.2	5.5	10.9	3.6	12.7	0	0	3.6	0	0	0	3.6	0	0		28.1
TOMITA	3.2	64.5	6.4	3.2	3.2	0	0	0	12.9	0	0	0	6.4	0	0		15.8
ZENBA	23.4	23.4	14.9	14.9	10.6	4.3	2.1	0	0	0	0	6.4	0	0	0		23.0
Percent of Total Functions	15.3	39.8	10.2	10.2	6.6	5.1	0.5	1.0	3.1	1.0	0.5	2.6	4.1	0	0		

APPENDIX E

Teacher Writing
Week 9
Total Counts

TEACHER TO:	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Promising	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Total Teacher Production
FUJII	5	9	3	7	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	7	36
HAYASHI	11	7	3	1	4	2	0	2	3	0	1	0	4	1	4	0	4	43
SUZUKI	19	6	2	0	6	3	0	2	6	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	2	51
TOMITA	12	3	1	2	4	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	34
ZENBA	5	9	4	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	0	4	6	0	3	0	1	40
Total per Function	52	34	13	10	15	12	1	4	22	0	1	4	20	1	14	1	18	204

APPENDIX F

Teacher Writing
Week 9
Percents

TEACHER TO:	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Promising	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Simultaneous Functions	Percent of Total Teacher Production
FUJI	13.5	24.3	8.1	18.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	0	2.7	0	0	0	5.4	0	13.5	2.7		17.6
HAYASHI	25.6	16.3	7.0	2.3	9.3	4.7	0	4.7	7.0	0	2.3	0	9.3	2.3	9.3	0		21.1
SUZUKI	37.2	11.8	3.9	0	11.8	5.9	0	3.9	11.8	0	0	0	11.8	0	1.9	0		25.0
TONITA	35.3	8.8	2.9	5.8	11.7	2.9	0	0	23.5	0	0	0	5.8	0	2.9	0		16.7
ZENBA	12.5	22.5	10.0	0	0	12.5	0	0	10.0	0	0	10.0	15.0	0	7.5	0		19.6
Percent of Total Functions	25.5	16.7	6.4	4.9	7.4	5.9	0.5	2.0	10.8	0	0.5	2.0	9.8	0.5	6.9	0.5		

APPENDIX G

Student Writing
Week 9
Total Counts

STUDENT	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Imitation	Simultaneous Functions	Total Student Production
FUJI	5	7	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	1	0	8	28
HAYASHI	17	14	3	7	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	7	54
SUZUKI	10	30	1	0	8	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	55
TOMITA	9	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	28
ZENBA	8	15	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	45
Total per Function	49	73	7	21	15	4	2	2	8	0	0	8	6	1	7	7	20	210

APPENDIX H

Student Writing Week 9 Percents

STUDENT	Reporting Opinions	Reporting Personal Facts	Reporting General Facts	Responding to Questions	Predicting	Giving Directives	Apologizing	Thanking	Evaluating	Offering	Requesting Clarification	Requesting Personal Information	Requesting General Information	Requesting Opinions	Formulas	Imitation	Simultaneous Functions	Percent of Total Student Production
FUJI	17.8	25.0	3.5	14.2	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	28.5	3.5	0	0.5	0		13.3
HAYASHI	31.4	25.9	5.6	12.4	7.4	1.9	3.7	0	1.9	0	0	0	1.9	0	0	0		25.7
SUZUKI	18.2	54.5	1.8	0	14.5	1.8	0	1.8	3.6	0	0	0	3.6	0	0	0		26.2
TOMITA	32.1	25.0	7.1	0	3.6	0	0	3.6	12.9	0	0	0	7.1	3.6	0	0		13.3
ZENBA	17.8	33.3	0	22.2	4.4	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.4	15.6		21.4
Percent of Total Functions	23.3	34.8	3.3	10.0	7.1	1.9	1.0	1.0	3.8	0	0	3.8	2.9	0.5	3.3	3.3		